

## *REMARKS*

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application and for the indication of allowable subject matter in the Advisory Action mailed on March 23, 2006.

Claims 2, 5-7 and 10-12 are now present in this application. Claims 2, 5, 6 and 10-12 are independent. By this Amendment, claims 2, 5, 6 and 10-12 are amended and claims 1, 3, 4, 8 and 9 are canceled. Claims 13-20 were previously canceled. No new matter is involved.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The Advisory Action states that claims 2, 6-7 and 10-12, as amended in the amendment filed on February 21, 2006 would be allowable if submitted in a separate amendment canceling the non-allowed claims. The Advisory Action also states that claim 5 would be allowable if re-written in independent form and amended to address the rejection of that claim under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph in the October 20, 2005 Office Action. The Advisory Action further indicates that claim 6 would be allowable if amended to address the issues in the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment attached to the Advisory Action.

*I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph*

In the Office Action dated October 20, 2005, claims 1-7 and 10-12 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the language “the second conveying rollers” lacks proper antecedent basis. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is moot with respect to claims 1, 3 and 4, because those claims have been canceled.

Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is moot with respect to claims 10-12 because the Advisory Action clearly states that claims 10-12 would be allowable if the non-allowed claims are canceled. Applicant has canceled the claims indicated in the Advisory Action to be non-allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is moot with respect to claim 5. Claim 5 has been re-written in independent form in a manner that removes the “second conveying rollers” language, thereby overcoming the rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is moot with respect to claim 6, because the Advisory Action indicates that the only outstanding issue with respect to claim 6 is the existence of a word having strikethrough, which has been canceled in the amendment, above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 5-7 and 10-12 are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

## *II. Rejection under 35 USC § 102*

In the Office Action dated October 20, 2005, claims 1 and 3-4 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Ariga. This rejection is respectfully traversed as moot because claims 1, 3 and 4 have been canceled by this amendment.

## *III. Non-Compliant Amendment of Claim 6*

Claims 6 has been amended to delete "the" to overcome the basis for the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment attached to the Advisory Action. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 is in condition for allowance.

## *IV. Conclusion*

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the (1) October 20, 2005 Office Action, (2) Advisory Action dated March 23, 2006, and (3) the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment attached to the Advisory Action, and that all of the stated grounds of rejection and objection have been properly

traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that (1) the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and objections and that they be withdrawn, (2) the proposed amendments be entered; and (3) this Application be promptly passed to issue.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Robert J. Webster, Registration No. 46,472, at (703) 205-8000, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) respectfully petitions for a two (2) month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of \$900.00 is attached hereto.


Application No.: 10/726,535  
Art Unit 3653


Attorney Docket No. 0630-1874P  
Supplemental Reply to October 20, 2005 Office Action  
Page 11

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By:   
Scott L. Lowe  
Reg. No.: 41,458

SLL/RJW:gf 

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
Telephone: (703)205-8000

Check: \$900.00 extension fee